
Sent: 12/11/2019 10:25:04 AM
Subject: Online Submission

12/11/2019

MR John Woolfe
9 Moore ST
Clontarf NSW
john.woolfe@optus.com.au

RE: DA2019/1149 - 11 Moore Street CLONTARF NSW 2093

My wife and I are the owners of 9 Moore Street Clontarf and are adjoining neighbours to the Applicant's house on its eastern side. We make the following submissions in relation to Application DA2019/1149.

Summary:

Significant adverse impacts in relation to privacy, view loss and overshadowing arise from this proposal;

The proposal is not consistent with DCP objectives in relation to set back, privacy, view loss and overshadowing; and

The Applicant's Statement of Environmental Effects (Statement) in relation to set back, privacy, view loss and overshadowing is incorrect and misleading.

Significant view loss to southwest & west:

The outlook from our house is 270 degrees from the east through to the north west. As the proposed development is on the western side of our house then we will be deprived of significant sweeping south west & western views. The Statement is very selective in that it makes no reference to our south west & western viewing opportunities and any loss thereof. The only reference to viewing opportunities it refers to is opportunities for properties to the north (see page 7).

Southern aspect set back and total view loss:

The majority of houses on the south side of Moore St (our & the Applicant's side) are 2 stories. All of these houses have the south facing facades of their second storeys set back approx. 4 meters from the south facing facade of their lower storeys. As the land falls away significantly east to west this set back provides a cascading western view corridor and also retains the privacy of each house. The Applicant's design does not have this set back. The affect is that the addition structurally situates itself 4 meters in front of the set back and totally eliminates our western cascading view from our balcony and also deprives us of our western harbour views from our living area and kitchen.

Loss of privacy:

Due to the east to west land fall the addition's floor level is at the same level as the floor level of our lower storey. The proposed windows on the addition's eastern side (W3,4 & 5) particularly the 3 clear glass pane window (W4) will look directly into our 2 bedrooms on our lower level and our kitchen and living areas. The confirmation in the Statement that DCP objective 3.4.2.1 ("There will be no viewing conflict from opposing windows between adjoining dwellings") is totally incorrect. There is a viewing conflict which results in a very significant loss of privacy.

Proposed window W4 consists of 3 panes of clear glass and are sliding. There has been no consideration given to our privacy and W4 must be removed. In relation to windows W3 & W5 notwithstanding that the panes are translucent they slide open and therefore there is really only one pane that is translucent. If these windows are retained they must not be sliding and only wind open from the bottom and be at head height i.e. the bottom of the window to be 165 cm from floor level.

Roof Height:

The proposed roof design consists of a 12 degree pitch and has no sky light windows so there is no practical reason for this design. Further the height exceeds the limit of 8.5 m by 0.95 m. The proposed roof will deprive us of our western views from our living areas and kitchen. The roof currently is flat and should remain so. Further as we will look directly onto this roof it must be constructed of non reflective material in accordance with DCP objective 3.4.

Over shadowing:

The applicant's shadow diagram for 12 June at 3pm shows an extension of shadow over our pool and surrounding pool area which has been designed to be tucked away from the southerly winds and is a sun trap. We use this area extensively in winter to relax and entertain. The extended shadow line will eliminate this sun trap and detrimentally impacts the use of our property and lifestyle. If this addition is set back, as it should have been, then this overshadowing will be lessened.

3.2 Numeric Summary in Statement:

The proposed FSR for the basement level is incorrect. The Applicant's house is already a 2 storey house. We note in the submission of M/s Li dated 8/11/19, that she outlines the layout of the lower ground floor. I have inspected this property and agree with her layout and her statement that the gross floor area is approx. 98 m² plus bathroom and storage/laundry which is far in excess of the 56 m² stated in the Statement.

The Building Height exceeds the required 8.5 m by 0.95 m.

Rear Set Back is not referred to at all in the Statement.

Attendance at our house:

If it would be of assistance to the Council planning officer to fully appreciate the reasons for our submissions he/she is welcome to come to our house for a viewing. My contact number is 0432484105.

Conclusion:

This proposal results in a 3 storey building which is inconsistent with the prevailing building height of a 2 storey house and objectives in the DCP and creates significant view loss, very considerable privacy impact and showdown line impact. For all of these above reasons we believe that this application should be refused.

Regards

Sue & John Woolfe